

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

January 15, 2013 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Present:

Members:

Janet Langdell, Chairperson
Paul Amato
Kathy Bauer
Chris Beer
Steve Duncanson
Malia Ohlson, Alternate
Judy Plant

Staff:

Jodie Levandowski, Town Planner
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary
Zac Steinbrekker, Videographer

Excused:

Tom Sloan

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. In accordance with the requirements of NH RSA 675:3, the Milford Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to discuss proposed amendments to amend language relative to Accessory Dwelling Units under Article IV and Article X of the Town of Milford Zoning Ordinance, *Definitions and Administrative Relief*.

MINUTES:

2. Approval of minutes from the 12/18/12 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

3. **CoorsTek, Inc. – Powers St – Map 43, Lot 29;** Public Hearing for a site plan amendment to construct a 3,000 SF addition with associated site improvements; and waivers from Development Regulations Article V, Section 5.04.KK, Landscaping Plan and Section 5.04.LL, Stormwater Plan.
(*Meridian Land Services, Inc*)
4. **Ducal Development, LLC – North River Rd & Mont Vernon St – Map 8, Lot 52;** Public Hearing for design review of a proposed senior housing development consisting of twenty-four (24) independent units.
(*Meridian Land Services, Inc.*)

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. She then explained the process for the public hearing, introduced the Board and Staff and read the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance with the requirements of NH RSA 675:3, the Milford Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to discuss proposed amendments to amend language relative to Accessory Dwelling Units under Article IV and Article X of the Town of Milford Zoning Ordinance, *Definitions and Administrative Relief*.

Amend Article X: Section 10.02.6 Accessory Dwelling Units to revise language relative to accessory dwelling units.

Chairperson Langdell noted that this was tabled from the 12/18/12 meeting and read the notice into the record. She then referenced correspondence from Bill Parker dated 1/8/13 addressing the question of whether a stand-alone ADU could be built today and under the proposed changes to the language that was discussed at the last meeting. The answer is yes to the current language as a subordinate use to the primary residence and yes under the proposed language; however, after discussion with Jodie and Bill it was suggested that we add some additional language for clarification. The proposed revision is listed in item G on the Staff Memo dated 1/10/13. *An ADU shall be located in an existing or proposed single-family home, its detached accessory structure(s), or as a stand-alone dwelling unit subordinate to the single-family home.* That language change would also need to translate over into the definition of ADU in Article IV.

K. Bauer referenced the deleted section *h* and asked if it is implied that all the criteria of the zoning district including lot sizes, frontage, yard requirements and height requirements be met? J. Langdell said yes. P. Amato added that it would be just like a garage or an addition and if you wanted to put it in the setback, you would have to seek relief.

Chairperson Langdell opened the discussion for public comment on the proposed zoning amendment; there was no comment and the public portion was closed.

S. Duncanson made a motion to post and publish the proposed amendment to Article X, to the March 2013 warrant. J. Plant seconded and all in favor.

Amend Article IV, definitions; Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to clarify language relative to accessory dwelling unit.

Chairperson Langdell noted that Article IV was technically posted in December; however, after a poll, there was consensus from the Board to revisit this. The added language *.....or as a stand-alone dwelling unit subordinate to the single-family home* is not a really a substantive change but more for clarification.

Chairperson Langdell opened the discussion for public comment on the proposed zoning amendment; there was no comment and the public portion was closed.

C. Beer made a motion to post and publish the proposed amendment to Article IV, to the March 2013 warrant. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

MINUTES:

J. Langdell submitted one change to the minutes; on line 185 to remove the word *said*. C. Beer made a motion to approve the minutes, as amended, from the 12/18/12 meeting. S. Duncanson seconded. P. Amato and M. Ohlson abstained and all else in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

CoorsTek, Inc. – Powers St – Map 43, Lot 29; Public Hearing for a site plan amendment to construct a 3,000 SF addition with associated site improvements; and waivers from Development Regulations Article V, Section 5.04.KK, Landscaping Plan and Section 5.04.LL, Stormwater Plan.

No abutters were present.

Chairperson Langdell recognized:
Jay Heavisides, Meridian Land Services, Inc.
Dean Croucher, CoorsTek, Inc.

J. Langdell noted that the application was complete according to the staff memo. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not present potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

J. Heavisides presented plans dated 12/10/12 and explained the proposal to construct a 3,000 SF addition to the existing facility in an area that is currently paved and to add three storage trailers. There will be no increase in impervious surface and no other improvements to the site.

Per the parking calculations, fifty-five (55) spaces are required but there are eighty-nine (89) on site. Four (4) handicapped spaces are also required; we have two, and so we will stripe an additional three on the south side of the parcel. There will not be any grading done. The dumpster currently located within the loading dock area will be moved around the building onto a concrete pad where there is currently a roll-off storage container that will also be moved. Staff suggested screening for the dumpster, but is it really needed? D. Croucher stated that the dumpster is a self-contained compactor accessed from inside the building and will not be seen from out front. P. Amato noted that this building is in an industrial park with other industry nearby and he doesn't know what we'd be screening it from. J. Heavisides said there are currently five (5) pole lights around the parking lot and at least four (4) building mounted lights and we are not proposing any changes to the site lighting. We would also like to add three (3) more storage trailers on a bed of rip rap, in the northwest corner. The drainage on the site travels down to that corner and flows out into a minor rip rap ditch at the edge of pavement and the placement of the trailers will not interrupt the flow of the drainage.

P. Amato inquired if the site currently meets our landscaping requirements. J. Levandowski replied that it doesn't meet the regulations but they are located in the Industrial zone and offer some shrubs and bushes along the front of the building and additional landscaping where other properties in the area do not. J. Heavisides also noted that the south and west sides are treed although the area for the relocated storage is fairly thin and open. J. Langdell said according to Town and State regulations, we look for justice to be done and the public interest to be secured when we grant a waiver. J. Heavisides reiterated that this is an older industrial park. They will maintain the existing landscaping and the treed area does provide adequate buffer to the residential area in back. J. Langdell inquired about the vegetation to the northwest. J. Heavisides said it is mostly evergreens with some deciduous trees and you have to look very hard to see the house. There is a steep drop off and the storage trailers are ten (10') ft down. For stormwater, there will be no impact from these improvements and the amount of impervious surface will stay the same.

K. Bauer stated that she did not have any problem with this proposal.

Chairperson Langdell opened the hearing to the public; there being none, the public portion of the meeting was closed. She then reviewed the comments from the staff memo dated 1/15/13.

J. Heavisides inquired if an as-built was needed. J. Langdell referred to the Building Department comments. J. Levandowski also noted that the former site plan on file in the office is very minimal. She will speak with the Building Inspector to confirm what will be needed. P. Amato said that this proposed plan, and as long as they follow this plan, would be sufficient. J. Heavisides said this plan will have to be signed prior to the building permit being issued. He then asked if there was concern with vehicles parked in front of the storage. J. Levandowski replied that there was some confusion as to whether the storage units would need access. There is sufficient parking on the site so are those spaces actually needed? D. Croucher said that the storage would be accessed weekly and those spaces in front of the trailers aren't needed.

P. Amato made a motion to grant both waivers. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor.

P. Amato made a motion to grant approval of the application, subject to staff recommendations; remove the parking, update note #7 and that the appropriate plans are provided. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

Ducal Development, LLC – North River Rd & Mont Vernon St – Map 8, Lot 52; Public Hearing for design review of a proposed senior housing development consisting of twenty-four (24) independent units.

Abutters present:

David and Dawn Mallows, North River Rd

Lise Mendham, Souhegan Nursing Association

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Erol Duymazlar, Ducal Development, LLC

Ken Clinton, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

J. Langdell noted that the application was complete according to Staff. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. J. Plant seconded and all in favor.

K. Bauer recused herself for this application; the BOS alternate was not available so there will only be a six (6) member board.

C. Beer made a motion that this application did not present potential regional impact. M. Ohlson seconded. S. Duncanson abstained and all else in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters into the record.

Chairperson Langdell asked staff which plan went out for interdepartmental review. J. Levandowski replied that with the exception of the Fire Department, it was the originally submitted plan dated 12/17/12. That plan, although not significantly different, is not the plan being reviewed tonight. The plan dated 1/8/13 has some minor changes, notes added and the turning radius revised per the Fire Department's request.

Chairperson Langdell also noted that we have received a verbal request from the Traffic Safety Advisory Committee that they would like to review these plans and add input. There was consensus from the Board to honor the request. J. Langdell then instructed Jodie to send the most current material to the committee so they could review the information as soon as possible and submit a summary to this Board. They may want to meet earlier than their regularly scheduled meeting to do so.

K. Clinton briefly summarized the recent history of this project and stated that the purpose of this design review is to discuss a few key aspects so that we can complete the design suitable enough to come back and discuss the details. This is a broad brush stroke of the overall project and tonight's goal is to talk about access, the private drives, the unit layout, and the drainage approach.

The property located at the intersection of North River Rd and Rte 13, also known as the Hutchinson property, is primarily open with large pines that wrap around the east and north sides of the property. Future applications will be submitted for a minor subdivision to divide off the existing house into its own residential lot and a site plan for the remainder of the 4.24 acre property to be developed under the senior housing ordinance. The subdivision will be dependent on the approval of the senior housing, which this design review will focus on. As we've gone through this process, there have been numerous directions presented and we will have to weigh a large amount of input from other agencies, departments, boards, committees and commissions as well as adhere to Town ordinances and State regulations.

Key points:

- The ZBA granted approval for a special exception to allow not more than twenty-four (24) units or forty-eight (48) bedrooms,
- There will be two points of access with the primary access coming off Mont Vernon St (Rte 13) and secondary or emergency access coming off North River Rd, which will be gated with a Knox lock to prohibit the general public from using the private road as a cut-thru. Both have received preliminary approval from the NH DOT, as they are state roads; however, we will need to show that drainage will not affect the public road system to get final approval.

- For the drainage, we wanted to make sure we got the ZBA endorsement before we went too far in the design process. In doing our due diligence we realized that this site actually receives about eighteen (18) acres of adjacent drainage from the town and state drainage systems that outlet onto this property of less than five (5) acres. That comes through three culverts located at the intersection of North River Rd and Rte 13. Trying to resolve that at the state level would be very time consuming so our determination as a group was to deal with this situation, factor it in as if it were our own and treat it. DES wants as much on-site infiltration as possible for the AOT permit and in order to do so, we created an infiltration basin on the southeast corner that is far larger by a substantial degree than otherwise needed if we were just treating our own four (4) acres. The basin starts shallower near unit #24 and gradually becomes deeper as it goes towards the intersection. There are also subtle treatments throughout the property and the drainage was the primary driving force for the design of this site.
- The interior roads will be privately owned and privately maintained so there is no impact or oversight by the Town; they will be dead-ends and will not have any high speed traffic as there will be no destination for the general public.
- There will be four different types of units. Units 1-7 and 22-24 are singles, units 8-13 are duplexes, 14-17 in the new structure will be garden style with two up and two down, and units 18-21 will be located in the current barn. In this design, the barn will only be twenty-three (23') ft from the property line instead of the required 30ft setback for senior housing so we will be seeking a formal waiver in order to preserve the barn. It is a known structure and we feel we can rework it into an interesting layout for the four garden style units. The exterior of the barn has yet to be determined, but more than likely it will resemble a barn. Although the hardship for the waiver may be seen as self-created, we still have to keep the regular district setback of 15ft for the subdivision of the Hutchinson House. Each of the single units have a garage and we created two detached garage bays for the garden units, four bays each. The common room will connect the current barn with units 14-17 in the new structure. It is located in the middle and will break up the overall aesthetics and footprint of the barn. The lower level will be for storage and the meeting room will be upstairs with a small kitchenette and handicapped accessible bathroom. It will have space for thirty-eight (38) chairs although at this time, it is not necessarily calculated at the 5% as required because the overall floor space has not been finalized. Perhaps we might consider a waiver for that as well, depending on the calculations.
- The open space requirement is 30% and we have had discussion throughout this process and referenced note #13. The gross open space is at 64%, the effective/useable open space, which is the open space less the limited common areas, is still around 56%. The open space less the limited common areas and the drainage areas is near 40%, so we still exceed the requirements. The central green, right in front of the community room, is almost 16,000 SF or 8.6% of the total area and that in effect is a minimum lot size on municipal water.
- We hired a professional forester, Charles Koch of Jaffrey NH, in December to inspect the property with a focus on the large white pines or pasture pines on the east and northerly sides. It was his opinion that both rows of white pines could become a public safety issue and further in his report, he recommended, as a course of action, to remove both rows of white pines to remove the risk of blow downs, root damage compromising tree health, and tree limbs falling on houses. We're committed to replacing the landscaping and buffer as shown on this plan and we have engaged Randy Knowles, a professional landscape architect to do the final landscaping design for our final plan set but all the details can be worked out once we get this general layout approved. He then submitted the letter dated 1/2/13.

P. Amato commented that if you take the pines down, it will change the look of the area drastically, all we'll see is a detention basin. The visual impact will be affected for the next twenty-five years. K. Clinton agreed that there will be a substantial visual change, but until the size of the detention basin is formalized, some of the tall pines at the intersection may be able to be saved but isolated trees have a higher risk and those trees are unsafe today. He referenced the Currier Self-Storage facility to show how the trees will grow and a brief discussion on safety followed.

K. Clinton read the Staff Memo dated 1/15/13.

- Fire Department comments: We provided the requested fifty (50) ft turnarounds and a hydrant on the property; however, the turnarounds might not been what Jason had expected. He probably envisioned a different configuration and we will meet again to go over our modifications and make sure he agrees with our

approach from the side of the T. The access entrances meet the radius requirements and it was really the two dead-end turnarounds that he concentrated, which we increased from twenty (20) ft to fifty (50) ft. to accommodate the 50 ft ladder truck which is the department's longest piece of equipment. J. Langdell referenced the email from Jason Smedick dated 1/11/13. K. Clinton stated that from his understanding, the turnaround stem is not needed on something less than a 150ft lane, per NFPA. A ladder truck wouldn't likely drive down that short section of road because a fire in the one story units would be addressed from staying on the main access, but he is committed to meeting with Jason again.

- Environmental comments: The drainage is probably farther along than the respondent understood and we did consider permeable pavement but there is no benefit based on the nature of this development. If we get a favorable endorsement of the overall design tonight, we will meet with Fred Elkind regarding our approach prior to completing our drainage design.
- DPW comments: There is a proposed crosswalk from our site to the Town's sidewalk on the opposite side of North River Rd. Surprisingly, crosswalks are not controlled by DOT, they fall under the Traffic Bureau. At this time, we are not contemplating any improvements to the Town's sidewalk for ADA compliance and we will pursue the location with the NH Traffic Bureau.

J. Langdell inquired why that location was selected. K. Clinton said per feedback because although a person could be better seen, a person walking through the intersection might affect stacking by waiting for that person to cross, so it was shifted to the northwest. If you go too far west, you get into a sight issue so this was a good middle ground, also enhanced by the fact that we are not seeking to butt into curbing. J. Langdell said given the fact that we've seen a variety of plans at different times and at different meetings, would there be any issues if the crosswalk was moved further west so that it's at the corner of the proposed subdivision going across to the Souhegan Valley Nursing Association lot. K. Clinton said he understands the consideration but it was placed so that someone walking across is not going into a private drive. The current location provides something to aim towards and a car can safely approach traffic. J. Langdell said assuming there is no issue with the southern access from North River Rd, would there be any sight or other issues from a roadway standpoint if you moved the crosswalk to the northeast. K. Clinton said he would consider that a secondary location and would not be opposed to moving it if the Board and the Traffic Bureau were in favor. J. Langdell stated that our plans don't show the walkway. K. Clinton explained that tonight's presentation plan shows the walkway, but there is more leeway with the location of that and the crosswalk.

- Ambulance comments: We are committed to having a lock on the gate and we will have private drive names to aid in emergency response. We would even consider directional signage.
- Zoning: No comments at this time.
- Building: No comments at this time.

Proposed meetings:

- Water and Sewer: We will meet with the Water and Sewer utility to finalize the sewer extension design which was originally done in the 1970's. We will vet that, make sure it is up to current standards and perform minor design modifications. We already have the commissioners' approval.
- Fire Department.
- Environmental Services.
- Traffic Safety Advisory Committee: I will meet a second time with the committee.

M. Ohlson asked if there would be signs indicating that the emergency access gate was not a thru-way. K. Clinton said it was far enough back for emergency vehicles to stage while they unlock the gate, but we can consider that request. He will bring it up with the Traffic Safety Advisory Committee. M. Ohlson referenced the pine trees and asked if it would be possible to do selective clearing and pruning. K. Clinton replied that the vegetation on the trees is up higher and they are unruly so one can see through the understory. He understands and agrees there will be a substantial change but those trees are a safety hazard now and will become more so.

J. Plant inquired how a handicapped person could access the second floor common room. K. Clinton said there are walkways from the parking area at a reasonable grade to the second floor entrance. The lower level would be similar to a walk-out basement. E. Duymazlar distributed a package that showed examples and floor plans, noting

that page 6 showed the community room. S. Duncanson inquired about the internal staircase. E. Duymazlar said that was going down to the parking area explained the layout and access. J. Langdell said if I lived in one of the single units and am using a walker or wheelchair, I would have to go all the way around the parking area and building to access this room. J. Plant asked if there was a way to make an additional entrance from the other end and discussion followed. K. Clinton said the existing barn acts as a retaining wall. We are talking about 55+ independent living and not some of the other options in the ordinance. J. Langdell clarified 55 and older, in an aging population, spoken by a community health nurse. E. Duymazlar said it is important to note that both levels of the building will be fully accessible, it's just that you will not be able to do so internally. Our vision is that the general public and residents will congregate in the upper level; the lower level is for storage. J. Plant said that she would have a hard time accepting a common room that didn't have enough seating for every individual resident. E. Duymazlar said the room could hold more seats but he wouldn't want to do so. He then referenced the Peacock Brook Condo meetings and said that people don't use that space as much. J. Langdell said that a community room is included in the Senior Housing Ordinance as a facility that is available for the residents' use. We speak to passive and active recreation as a meeting area for the pocket neighborhood. It's not just meetings but bridge clubs and parties. E. Duymazlar asked if it would be reasonable to expect everybody to show up on that one night for one event. J. Langdell said this Board would like to see the square footage for the total floor space and then work back from there. Discussion ensued.

P. Amato noted that the two units on the lower level would only have daylight on the east side and he was concerned with fire accessibility on the back side. E. Duymazlar recognized the concern and explained that they are only one bedroom units and we will have big windows and doors with as much glass on that side as we can get. P. Amato asked if the barn would be done the same way. E. Duymazlar replied yes. P. Amato said he is not sure the community room is big enough. He doesn't know how much it will be used, but it might be in your best interest to meet the 5% requirements. K. Clinton said he was not sure what the basis for the 5% was and condo association meetings are usually sparsely attended. There is space for thirty-eight (38) chairs and we can go over the specifics at the next meeting. We may ask for a waiver, but are comfortable with the current size. P. Amato said just because this Board may sit quietly during design review, it does not mean that we are in agreement with what you say. We can bring up anything during final review whether it was brought up tonight or not. K. Clinton stated that we are not considering lack of further discussion complacent agreement. J. Langdell added that this was step one and design review will not be finished tonight. P. Amato said the internal stairs take up a lot of space. E. Duymazlar said the intent of that was not for the community room or the storage but for the detached garages. He wanted to give the residents an option to not have to walk out in the elements, all the way around the building, to get into their cars and then described the layout. P. Amato inquired what the plan for the Hutchinson House was. E. Duymazlar said we are planning to re-sell it but keep it in its current state. P. Amato brought up the units in the barn and asked if there could be garages underneath instead of apartments. It would be a little bit of a concession and potentially more workable. E. Duymazlar said they looked at that extensively but unfortunately, in order to preserve the barn with the existing foundation, the posts and ceiling height make it difficult to make it work and it also becomes very cumbersome with multiple staircases. P. Amato said it may be best to take the barn down and make the new building look like a barn. He referenced the former White Horse barn.

E. Duymazlar said these are preliminary plans; at what stage does the Board want to see fully developed architectural drawings? P. Amato said first you need to get the drainage calculations done to see what the elevations are. K. Clinton said that is why they were pausing at this point in the design. Keeping the existing barn has been difficult.

S. Duncanson said due to the subdivision line and retaining wall, that area would not actually be useable land. E. Duymazlar said that land would be part of the required 15,000SF and he is not sure it isn't usable. There is a drop off that varies from one to six ft and the distance to the boundary is approximately five ft. The existing retaining wall is landscaped above and below and has a split rail fence. S. Duncanson said if there would be an easement for sewer and if that would be another area of unusable land and you couldn't put a shed back there. E. Duymazlar said there would be an easement and it would be a fully usable surface. The Town would prevent any structures in that area from a setback standpoint. S. Duncanson inquired how the units would be heated. E. Duymazlar said most likely natural gas; they have had discussions with National Grid to extend the service on Mont Vernon St. Since we will be opening that section of the road from Sunset Cir for sewer, it seems reasonable

to put in the natural gas lines. If not natural gas, then it more than likely would be propane and we would have numerous locations for multiple underground tanks with shared lines. S. Duncanson asked if you take down the white pines behind 7, 8 and 9, how will you ensure the health of the abutter's pines. K. Clinton said Erol has had conversations with the Mallows. E. Duymazlar said we both recognize there are some challenges and are open to working with each other to make a good buffer and a safe one. S. Duncanson said he'd like to see the proposed new lot moved to west a little so that the property line is actually at the retaining wall to give the residents more usable land than shown. A brief discussion about the retaining wall followed. K. Clinton said he understands your point of view, and he might share that point of view, but there is nothing wrong with the lot as configured. The buyer will have a choice as to where to live and they can choose not to buy the property. S. Duncanson asked what the outcome from the Traffic Safety Advisory Committee was. J. Levandowski noted that the minutes from that meeting were not included in the Board's packets. K. Clinton said he met with them early on in the process and there wasn't a singular directive or sole direction to head in; of the 8-10 committee members in attendance at that meeting, there were 5-6 different and conflicting views. There was no clear direction. I took their opinions into consideration, but ultimately, they are an advisory board and the decision on the access rests with the DOT.

Chairperson Langdell opened the hearing to the public.

D. Mallows said he was the abutter to the northwest and expressed concern with the berm and erosion if the pine trees were removed. What is being proposed for that area after the tree removal? J. Langdell noted that there are provisions within our Zoning Ordinance and Development Regulations that do require buffers. K. Clinton said the proposed grading will be within the 30 ft rear setback and will be 12-15ft off the common property line, so trees beyond that will be removed. There might be enough trees left near the property line to not affect the understory or the root system, but we will have to densify the buffer to create a visual break between the properties. There will be some drainage occurring specifically behind units 7-9 and then we will augment the buffer.

K. Bauer asked if there would be lighting for the development. Part of her concern was for the residents to the east looking down on this development. K. Clinton said the goal is to get an understanding or a level of endorsement for the key features about the site tonight and the lighting details will be a featured part of the landscaping and lighting package, but there is nothing specific at this time. At a minimum, every building will have its own entrance lights and there will be lights at the community room. J. Langdell noted that our regulations require downcast lighting. K. Bauer asked what the detention area will look like. K. Clinton replied much like you see now; it will be replanted with grasses and will be designed to store and infiltrate water for a 50 year storm. K. Bauer said it's not terribly attractive now and one can see the drainage and culverts. K. Clinton said they couldn't make the state's drainage system much more attractive because they can't change the grades at the outlets of those pipes. There is an unrecorded triangular flowage right granted to the state and although Ducal owns the land, technically it is the state's area to improve as they see fit. K. Bauer said she lived in this area for many years and this is a very, noisy, busy street. The buffer is also for noise, not just for sight. She also agrees with other Board member concerns regarding the community room. This room will be used for more activities than meetings and referenced the Town Hall banquet room that sometimes has more than one use at a time. The plan she had didn't have the pathways laid out so she was concerned for residents who will be using motorized wheelchairs or strollers along North River Rd to access the crosswalk. J. Langdell added that was part of her reasoning to move the crosswalk. C. Beer noted that the path was not on North River Rd, but on their property. E. Duymazlar explained that it is a private section of path, fifteen ft off the edge of pavement. K. Clinton described the pathway and reiterated that the walkway can be readily shifted, as can the crosswalk. K. Bauer stated that all the buildings were up against the setback line. K. Clinton said we are not proposing hard features of the buildings but they are designed that way on purpose. K. Bauer went on to say that when she looks at this plan, it seems overdeveloped. The open space requirements should be available to all occupants, not just the five ft around the buildings. Sixteen (16) buildings on four (4) acres is really pushing it. Are there elevations of what the standalone garages will look like? E. Duymazlar said the floor plans are preliminary and dependent on these meetings, we will hire an architect. J. Langdell asked if the styles shown tonight were indicative of the proposed structures. E. Duymazlar said very much so. K. Bauer pointed out that there are no sidewalks whatsoever on Mont Vernon Rd and they would make it safer for people living in this area. Also, the barn units do not appear to be well laid out.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

J. Langdell said she like the conceptual plan better when it included the Hutchinson House. E. Duymazlar said they did too, but there would be an extra ZBA variance required. J. Langdell if there were any discussions with the State about a left turn lane on Mont Vernon St. K. Clinton replied no. J. Langdell asked if there was traffic count information. K. Clinton said yes, the information was prepared for the ZBA but he didn't bring it tonight. The traffic report will be submitted within a week or so for the Board's review. The information was prepared in conjunction with Steve Pernaw, NRPC, and ground counts to develop an analysis and determine the level of service. J. Langdell referenced a previous plan with a recreational area for outside activities. That retention basin area is a little sloppy for that. K. Clinton said the prior plan was for a community garden in that area, but now we have a more centralized formal green area in the center. Handling the state and town drainage pretty much obscured that purpose. J. Langdell said that meditation/rain garden area was part of the active/passive recreation as well as the community room.

K. Clinton said over the next few weeks he will be involved with the groups, departments and individuals mentioned earlier and he is hopeful that we have some level of understanding that this design is reasonable to proceed with and then come back in one month's time to continue the design review. He will submit revised plans with major design elements a week before the next meeting so it could go into the Board's packets for review. He feels comfortable with a sense of the Board's comments, questions and concerns. Although we don't have a formal decision, we will proceed with his next steps including the drainage. J. Langdell said the philosophy here is to step through this discussion as fast as we can and not drag this out, but we need to dot our i's and cross our t's.

S. Duncanson made a motion to table the application for design review to the February 19th meeting. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

OTHER BUSINESS:

J. Langdell read the notice for an upcoming public meeting relative to the Emerson Rd/Armory Rd/Rte 13 intersection improvements to be held on Monday, 1/21/13 at 6:30 in the Town Hall, banquet hall.

P. Amato made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:45pm. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

MINUTES OF THE JAN 15, 2013 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING APPROVED FEB 19, 2013